

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Paul Higginbotham,  Complainant,  vs.  Pacific Bell Telephone Company,  Defendant.	Case 01-03-028 (March 7, 2001)
Izu Klepper,  Complainant,  vs.  Pacific Bell Telephone Company,  Defendant.	Case 01-05-059 (May 17, 2001)
Asha Goldberg,  Complainant,  vs.  Pacific Bell Telephone Company,  Defendant.	Case 01-05-068 (May 28, 2001)
Raymond A. Chamberlin,  Complainant,  vs.  Pacific Bell Telephone Company,  Defendant.	Case 01-07-023 (July 16, 2001)
Edward H. Joseph,  Complainant,  vs.  Pacific Bell Telephone Company,  Defendant.	Case 01-11-008 (November 5, 2001)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING  
CONSOLIDATING CASE 01-11-008, RESETTING DATE FOR  
STATUS REPORT, AND ORDERING PACIFIC BELL TELEPHONE  
COMPANY TO FILE AND SERVE DATA RESPONSE**

**1. Edward H. Joseph v. Pacific Bell Telephone Company, Case 01-11-008**

On November 5, 2001, Edward H. Joseph filed a complaint against Pacific Bell Telephone Company (Pacific). Mr. Joseph alleged that Pacific had ceased publishing in the white pages the local prefixes that a customer could call without incurring any additional charges. He sought a Commission order directing Pacific to resume publication of this information.

Pacific filed an answer to Mr. Joseph's complaint on December 17, 2001. In the answer, Pacific invited the Commission to consolidate the complaint with the four complaints that had been consolidated under C.01-03-028. Common questions of fact and law are involved in the consolidated proceeding and Mr. Joseph's. Therefore, pursuant to Rule 55 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, C.01-11-008 will be added to the consolidated proceeding.

**2. Date for Status Report**

Based on the workshop report I received from Commission Staff, the due date for a joint written status report from the parties will be re-set to 20 days after Pacific files and serves its response to the data request from Commission Staff.

**3. Data Response to be Filed and Served**

Attached to this ruling is a copy of a data request from Commission Staff to Pacific. To ensure that all interested parties receive a copy of the response, Pacific is directed to file and serve its response on all parties to these consolidated proceedings.

**IT IS SO RULED.**

Dated December 20, 2001, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ MARIBETH A. BUSHEY

Maribeth A. Bushey  
Administrative Law Judge

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



December 11, 2001

Ms. Cheryl Peters  
Pacific Bell, Room 2120  
140 New Montgomery St.  
San Francisco, CA 94105

Dear Ms. Peters,

Please provide the following information to the Telecommunications Division regarding the four complaint cases about toll-free prefix information to customers of Pacific Bell.

1. When did Pacific start issuing telephone directories that contained the lists of local and nearby calling prefixes? When did Pacific stop issuing telephone directories that contained the lists of local and nearby calling prefixes?
2. When did Pacific start issuing telephone directories that contained maps of local and nearby calling areas? When did Pacific stop issuing telephone directories that contained maps of local and nearby calling areas?
3. What types of service providers' prefixes did Pacific include in these lists: all ILEC, CLEC, cellular, paging? Did the lists include special-use prefixes? Please list any other criteria Pacific used in selecting prefixes to include in or exclude from those lists.
4. For the local and nearby calling prefix lists that Pacific previously printed in its directories, how many prefixes are included among called parties' prefixes in the subject area codes on the "list date" (see parameters below)?
5. How many prefixes are among local and nearby calling called parties' prefixes in the subject area codes on the "test date" (see parameters below)?
6. How many prefixes were located in a different rate center on the "test date" (see parameters below) than their location on the "list date"? Exclude from consideration any prefix that was not assigned to any service provider as of the "list date" or as of the "test date"
7. For each prefix moved, as defined in question 6, which rate center was the prefix moved from and to?

8. How many prefix entries in the local and nearby calling prefix lists on the list date were erroneous as of the test date, because of prefixes moved, as listed in your response to question 6 above? Count as erroneous only: (a) prefix entries in the list that were shown as “in your local calling area” but should have been shown as “in your Zone 3 calling area” or should have been excluded from the list entirely because they’re now beyond 16 miles, and (b) prefix entries in the list that were shown as “in your Zone 3 calling area” but should have been excluded from the list entirely because they’re now beyond 16 miles. Also, count as erroneous only those errors caused by moves of called parties’ prefixes.
9. What is the percentage of all prefix entries in these local and nearby calling prefix lists on the “list date” that are erroneous, as defined in question 8, as of the “test date”?

Questions 10 through 15 require you to provide the same information as you provide in answer to questions 4 through 9, but for only those prefixes assigned to Pacific Bell in the subject area codes.

10. For a local and nearby calling prefix list similar to those Pacific previously printed in its directories, but containing only prefixes assigned to Pacific Bell, how many different prefixes would be included among called parties’ prefixes in the subject area codes on the “list date” (see parameters below)?
11. How many prefixes would be included among called parties’ prefixes in the subject area codes on the “test date” (see parameters below)?
12. How many prefixes were located in a different rate center on the “test date” (see parameters below) than their location on the “list date”? Exclude from consideration any prefix that was not assigned to Pacific Bell as of the “list date” or as of the “test date”.
13. For each prefix moved, as defined in question 12, which rate center was the prefix moved from and to?
14. How many prefix entries in the local and nearby calling lists, as described in question 10, would be erroneous because of the prefixes moved, as listed in your response to question 12 above? Count as erroneous only: (a) prefix entries in the list that were shown as “in your local calling area” but should have been shown as “in your Zone 3 calling area” or should have been excluded from the list entirely because they’re now beyond 16 miles, and (b) prefix entries in the list that were shown as “in your Zone 3 calling area” but should have been excluded from the list entirely because they’re now beyond 16 miles. Also, count as erroneous only those errors caused by moves of called parties’ prefixes.
15. What is the percentage of all prefix entries in these local and nearby calling prefix lists on the “list date” that would be erroneous, as defined in question 14, as of the “test date”?
16. How many different telephone directories did Pacific Bell issue in each of the subject area codes during 1999?

Please use the following parameters in answering the above questions.

- (A) Assume that the printed list of prefixes that the caller consults is the Local and Nearby Calling prefix list that Pacific published one year prior to the last directory Pacific published containing a Local and Nearby Calling prefix list, and that this published list was accurate as of its publication date ("list date").
- (B) Assume that the caller consults all prefixes on the printed list on the date of publication of the last directory Pacific published containing a Local and Nearby Calling prefix list for each of the areas covered by the included directories ("test date").
- (C) Assume that "called parties' prefixes" means prefixes that are shown or should have been shown in the local and nearby calling lists either in the section stating "The following prefixes in the XXX area code are in your local calling area:" or in the section stating "The following prefixes in the XXX area code are in your Zone 3 calling area..."
- (D) Perform the error count described in questions 8 and 14 for each directory Pacific published in the 510 and 209 area codes.

Please provide the requested information by January 2, 2002.

If you have any questions about this data request, please call Bob Benjamin at 415-703-1069 or Daljit Singh at 415-703-1801.

Sincerely,

/s/ BOB BENJAMIN  
Bob Benjamin  
Public Utilities Regulatory Analyst,  
Telecommunications Division

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that I have by mail this day served a true copy of the original attached Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Consolidating Case 01-11-008, Resetting Date for Status Report, and Ordering Pacific Bell Telephone Company to File and Serve Data Response on all parties of record in this proceeding or their attorneys of record.

Dated December 20, 2001, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ JACQUELINE GORZUCH  
Jacqueline Gorzoch

**N O T I C E**

Parties should notify the Process Office, Public Utilities Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2000, San Francisco, CA 94102, of any change of address to insure that they continue to receive documents. You must indicate the proceeding number on the service list on which your name appears.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Commission's policy is to schedule hearings (meetings, workshops, etc.) in locations that are accessible to people with disabilities. To verify that a particular location is accessible, call: Calendar Clerk (415) 703-1203.

If specialized accommodations for the disabled are needed, e.g., sign language interpreters, those making the arrangements must call the Public Advisor at (415) 703-2074, TTY 1-866-836-7825 or (415) 703-5282 at least three working days in advance of the event.

Ms. Cheryl Peters  
December 11, 2001  
Page 5